| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary  | 10/656,775   | BENNETT ET AL.                   |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
|   | Examiner   | Art Unit                         |
|   | John Juba, Jr.   | 2872                             |
| All Participants:   | Status of Application:   |                                  |
| (1) <u>John Juba, Jr.</u> .   | (3)  |                                  |
| (2) Mr. Kenneth G. Pritchard.   | (4)  |                                  |
| Date of Interview: 6 December 2004  | Time:  | ÷                                |
| Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applica  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:  | ant's representative)  |                                  |
| Part I.   |  |                                  |
| Rejection(s) discussed: (none)  |  |                                  |
| Claims discussed: 18, 25, and 26  |  |                                  |
| Prior art documents discussed: See Continuation Sheet   |  |                                  |
| Part II.  |  |                                  |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:   |  |                                  |
|   |  |                                  |
| Part III.  ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. Part II.  ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa | ne examiner will provide a writ<br>,<br>record of the substance of the | e interview, since the interview |
|   |  |                                  |
|   |  |                                  |
|   |  |                                  |
|   |  |                                  |
|   |  | <u> </u>                         |
| Jalin July  |  |                                  |
| (Evaminar/SPE Signature) (Applican  | nt/Applicant's Representative S  | Signature – if appropriate)      |

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Continuation of Identification of prior art discussed: Subsequent to Applicants' election, the examiner contacted Applicants' representative to indicate that both the invention of Group I and Group II were allowable over the prior art. The examiner noted that, in Group II, claims 18 and 24 were substantial duplicates of claims 16 and 22. The examiner proposed that amendment of claim 18 to depend instead from claim 17, would resolve the issue in a manner that paralleled the claims of Group I. Applicants' drawings of January 6, 2004 did not bear a label identifying them as "Replacement Sheets". Thus, this submission is being treated as a proposed drawing correction, which has been approved, and which will necessitate submission of formal drawing sheets bearing the "Replacement Sheet" legend. With the proposed claim amendment, and the cancelation of claims 25 and 26 drawn to non-elected Groups III and IV, the application can be passed to issue. Applicants' representative authorized entry of the changes by examiner's amendment.